REMARKS

Claims 11-29 have been canceled, and Claims 30-39 have been added. Thus, Claims 1-10 and 30-39 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 1-10 have been amended.

Support for the claim amendments can be found on Figure 4 and its corresponding text in the specification.

Enclosed is an re-executed declaration that is in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.67(a). Thus, the objection to the declaration is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 11-12, 14-15, 17, 20-21, 23-25 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hyppönen et al.* (US 6,577,920). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 30) now recites "computer program code for categorizing a plurality of virus signatures into a respective one of a plurality of anti-virus sets according to their characteristic, wherein each of said anti-virus sets contains virus signatures sharing at least one common characteristic."

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed computer program code for categorizing is disclosed by *Hyppönen* in col. 3, lines 14-20. In col. 3, lines 14-20, *Hyppönen* teaches that a first database is defined to contain "known macro virus signatures," a second database is defined to contain "known and certified commercial macro signatures," and a third database is defined to contain "known and certified local macro signatures." Thus, according to *Hyppönen*, only the first database contains virus signatures while the second and third databases do not contain virus signatures. Such is also evident in Figure 2 of *Hyppönen*, because only the first determination step (col. 5, lines 43-46) is designed to check for viruses while the second and third determination steps (col. 5, lines 46-52) are not. As such, *Hyppönen*

does not teach or suggest "computer program code for categorizing a plurality of virus signatures into a respective one of a plurality of anti-virus sets according to their characteristic," as claimed.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by *Hyppönen*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-10 and 30-39 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 30 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any addition fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of the present application, please charge it against Lenovo Deposit Account No. **50-3533**.

Respectfully submitted,

Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS